

August 04, 2025

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT LAURA A. AUSTIN, CLERK
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA^{BY:} s/A. Beeson
ROANOKE DIVISION DEPUTY CLERK

OTIS T. MADISON,)
v. Plaintiff,) Case No. 7:24CV00749
CHADWICK DOTSON, ET AL.,)) **OPINION AND ORDER**
Defendants.) JUDGE JAMES P. JONES

Otis Madison, Pro Se Plaintiff.

The plaintiff, a Virginia prisoner proceeding pro se, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Madison alleges that while he was confined at Red Onion State Prison (Red Onion), a facility operated by the Virginia Department of Corrections (VDOC), prison officials used excessive force against him. In a prior Opinion and Order, I denied Madison's separate motion seeking interlocutory injunctive relief, finding no grounds showing imminent danger of irreparable harm.

Madison v. Dotson, No. 7:24CV00749, 2024 WL 5252495 (W.D. Va. Dec. 31, 2024). Thereafter, Madison filed a motion apparently based on the same factual allegations and asking for a transfer out of the western region of the VDOC. This submission was docketed as a renewed motion seeking interlocutory relief. After careful review of the record, I conclude that the motion must be denied as without merit.

A party seeking interlocutory injunctive relief must state facts clearly showing “that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). Each of these four factors must be satisfied before the court can grant this extraordinary type of relief. *Id.* For reasons stated in my previous Opinion and Order, Madison has not made the required showings to support his demand for the extraordinary relief he seeks.

Moreover, in the current submission, Madison seeks transfer to a different prison. He has no protected right to such relief. *Olim v. Wakinekona*, 461 U.S. 238, 245 (1983) (finding no liberty interest in avoiding interstate prison transfer).

For the reasons stated, it is **ORDERED** that the plaintiff’s motion seeking interlocutory injunctive relief, ECF No. 13, is DENIED.

ENTER: August 4, 2025

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Senior United States District Judge